

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii, iv, v
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
ARGUMENT	6
POINT I INDIANA LAW APPLIES TO THIS ACTION BECAUSE INDIANA HAS THE GREATEST INTEREST IN THE LITIGATION.....	6
A. A CONFLICT OF APPLICABLE LAW EXISTS BETWEEN INDIANA AND NEW YORK	6
B. INDIANA LAW APPLIES TO THE ACTION BECAUSE INDIANA HAS THE GREATEST INTEREST IN THE LITIGATION.....	8
1. LOSS ALLOCATING RULES: CONTRIBUTION and COMMON-LAW INDEMNITY.....	9
2. CONTRACTUAL CLAIMS.....	12
POINT II THE THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO STATE ANY CLAIMS UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED.....	14
A. STANDARD OF REVIEW ON A MOTION TO DISMISS	14
B. CONTRIBUTION AMONG JOINT TORFEASORS IS PROHIBITED IN INDIANA.....	15
C. COMMON-LAW INDEMNITY IS NOT AVAILABLE BECAUSE PERK-UP WAS NEGLIGENT AND DID NOT HAVE A SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH SHAMBAUGH.....	16
D. PERK-UP's CONTRACTUAL INDEMNIFICATION CLAIM SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE OF NO CONTRACTUAL INDEMNIFICATION OBLIGATION.....	17

E. PERK-UP'S THIRD-PARTY BENEFICIARY CLAIM
SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE
SHAMBAUGH-McCORMICK CONTRACT WAS
NOT INTENDED TO BENEFIT PERK-UP

POINT III THIRD-PARTY DISCOVERY SHOULD BE STAYED
PENDING A DETERMINATION OF THIS MOTION19

CONCLUSION20